



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

wonder, for they are the last men in the world to carry out a policy of kindness and conciliation. He says, "when the soldiers can obtain liquor, a quarrel with the Indians is sure to follow. In his opinion, if troops were removed, there would be peace."

COST OF INDIAN WARS. — Wendell Phillips is reported as reckoning the cost of all these as one billion dollars, an average of twelve million five hundred thousand dollars a year. Another says that our chief wars with them were from 1788 to 1828, forty years; but since then they have been less bloody but more costly. "The Seminole war in Florida cost fifteen thousand lives, and one hundred million dollars; the Sioux war, 1852-56, forty million dollars; and the Cheyenne, 1864, sixty million dollars." These estimates may be exaggerated; but our war-policy in dealing with the Indians has unquestionably wasted a fearful amount of money and life. How different would have been a truly and uniformly Christian policy like that of William Penn!

MORE HOPEFUL VIEWS OF PEACE.

During the late terrible conflict which so nearly rent asunder the fair fabric of our republic, I must confess to some misgivings in regard to the views of peace which I had fondly cherished for many years. But now that the smoke of war is passing away, my mind is settling back upon the same views so long entertained. Indeed, my convictions were never so strong as now in the belief of the speedy triumph of peace principles.

While a far greater evil than war in its most deadly aspect existed in our country, and well-nigh ruined our government, the friends of peace were for the time forced to accept (what they deemed) the lesser evil for the purpose of extirpating the greater. The period is fast hastening when slavery, with all its black catalogue of horrors, is to pass away not only from our own country, but from the world. War will then stand forth towering far above any and every other evil.

It was said of Washington as a panegyric, that he was "first in war." The time is fast coming when this will be regarded as doubtful praise. We have always been taught to esteem his counsel, "In time of peace prepare for war" to be of little less binding force than inspiration itself. Like the sons of Noah we would walk reverently backward while casting over his memory the mantle of charity; yet let us carefully examine this utterance in the light of history and experience. Ever since this utterance, our government has strictly followed his counsel. What is the result? Our expenses, in preparations for war, have been far greater than for all other purposes combined. Yet when the time came to call for the use of these war preparations, and they were most needed, it was found that many, if not a majority of those who had been educated at the national expense for the trade of war, were found fighting against us. Our war-ships were nearly all either turned against us, or had been sent away beyond our reach. Our forts were, many of them, in the hands of the enemy; so a great part of our other war material which had been accumulating at an almost fabulous cost, were so appropriated as to give aid and comfort to our enemies. Let us compare this utterance with one from the lips of a greater than Washington — "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

From the gloomy past, let us turn to the present and future of the cause of peace. To my mind, the cause

never before looked so hopeful. Slavery, that hitherto most prolific source of war, is fast vanishing from the world. The practiced eye can clearly discern a general uprising of the nations of Europe to demand with singular unanimity that hereafter war shall not swallow up so large a proportion of the resources of the nations; philanthropists and Christians in our own country are uniting in the demand.

I. T. H.

WEST KILLINGLY, CT.

We like the hopeful tone of our friend, and excuse, while we cannot endorse, his comparison of slavery as "a far greater evil than war." This may be the general impression, but only because people have a fuller, juster knowledge of the former than of the latter. So far, however, is this from the truth, that slavery began, far back in the history of war, as a mitigation of its evils. Instead of killing his enemies outright, the conqueror, as an act of mercy, made them slaves. Thus slavery originated in the idea of its being a *less* evil than war, and the common sense of mankind in every age and clime has confirmed this as true. A little calm reflection would prove it so.

SIGNS OF PROGRESS. — Our principles are gradually coming to be adopted by nations. On the 11th of November, 1868, a treaty containing the following very important clause was signed on behalf of Great Britain and the United States by their respective ministers, Lord Stanley and the Hon. Reverdy Johnson: — "The Commissioners shall have power to adjudicate upon the class of claims referred to in the official correspondence between the two Governments as to the *Alabama* claims; but before any of such claims are taken into consideration by them, the two high contracting parties shall fix upon some sovereign or head of a friendly state, as an arbitrator in respect of such claims, to whom such class of claims shall be referred, in case the commissioners shall be unable to come to an unanimous decision upon the same."

Another treaty has been lately (1868) negotiated between Sir John Bowring, LL. D., F. R. S., as Plenipotentiary for the king of Siam, and Baron Hochschild, as Plenipotentiary for the King of Sweden and Norway, in which an article has been introduced, providing that, in case of any misunderstanding between the sovereigns or subjects of the two countries, the dispute shall not be settled by an appeal to arms, but by the friendly arbitration of some neutral power. The same clause has been introduced in six treaties negotiated by Sir John Bowring. The first was that between the Belgian and the Hanoverian governments, in which the intervention of King Leopold induced his minister to accept this proposed clause. It has subsequently been conceded in treaties made by the Italians and the Swiss. In September, 1868, Sir John signed another treaty containing it between Belgium and Siam. A very few more such agreements may suffice to form what jurists would term "*binding precedents*," permanently recognized as part of the law of nations.

DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY IN WAR. — WHO IS RESPONSIBLE? — The question how far Government is responsible for property taken or destroyed in the prosecution of war, lately led to an earnest, protracted debate in the United States Senate. A Miss Murphy claimed damages for her house at Decatur, Alabama, destroyed by Gen. Sherman in